

12
A
CONTINUATION
OF A
Few Brief and Modest
REFLEXIONS
Perswading a Just
INDULGENCE
To be Granted to the
Episcopal Clergy
And PEOPLE in
SCOTLAND

TOGETHER WITH
A
POSTSCRIPT

*Vindicating the Episcopal Doctrine of Passive Obedience,
and the Archbishop of Glasgow's Sermon concerning it.*

Printed May 29th. Anno M. DCC. III.

A
CONTINUATION

OF
THE
NEW BUILDING AND MODEL

REPRESENTATIONS

FOR THE
IMPROVING A HOUSE

INDUSTRY

TO BE GRANTED TO THE

EDUCATIONAL
SOCIETY

OF THE
CITY OF LONDON

SCOTTLAND

TOGETHER WITH

POSTSCRIPT

AND THE HISTORY OF THE SOCIETY OF THE
CITY OF LONDON

Printed by J. Smith, at the New Building, No. 1, Pall Mall.

A

Continuation of a few brief and modest Reflexions, perswading a just *INDULGENCE* to be granted to the Episcopal Clergy and people in *Scotland*.

MY last gave a Plan of the State of the Nation, with Relation to those who desire Toleration and those who oppose it : In this I shall touch the Parties in their opposit Tenets, as to that Matter only : and I shall give the establishd Model, the Preference.

Those who now oppose Toleration, even in the single indulging for Divine Worship in Meeting-Houses, are those who very few years ago, did not only beg it (which was not lawful to do for an unlawful thing) but preacht it up as a religious Duty on Magistrates, especially on the Sovereign, to grant it; and an impiety, and a Branch, or rather a Root, of *Romish* and Antichristian Persecution, to refuse it : for if to grant Toleration to People, especially who differ only from the establishd Church-Government, in matters of Church Policie and Circumstances thereof; or in Rites of Worship, and yet agree with the establishd Church in all the Articles of Faith, contain'd in the Confession of Faith, sworn to and own'd by our first Reformers from Popery, and recorded and established by our Laws and

A

and Acts of Parliament, in the Reign of King *James* the sixth. I say, if to grant Toleration or Indulgence to such, in the years betwixt 1661. and 1688. was Piety; how is it transubstantiated now *Anno* 1703. into Impiety and Opposition to *Christs Kingdom*? I put it to the learned Writers against Toleration, to instance one Article of that Confession of Faith, which is disown'd by any who expects or desires a Toleration; And if it be only in indifferent matters and no Article of Faith, that the Dissenters now differ from you; Why so severe, as to deny to them in Charity, what you pleaded for as Duty, on the very same Grounds?

If the Argument was good, from Topics of Reason, Justice, Law, and much more if from Scripture Grounds, as you then violently contended; why not now? But to shew it stronger now; you were not then in the Nation, one to ten; Now the Dissenters from you are two to three at least, if not three to two.

I do not justify the severities used against you in those Days; no, I condemn them; But to hint at a Reason why the Toleration shall be rather granted *Now*, than at *that Time*, viz. Because, many, if not most, of the Dissenters *then*, did not only own Principles different from the established Church; but by *Overt Acts*, of writing, preaching, fighting, against the King & State disturb'd it. For allow me to put you to another Point, without owning many Severities executed against severals from 1666. to 1688. I say, produce me one Sentence amongst the Records of any Court, where one person was condemned, but on what was *Treason* and *Lese-Majesty* by Law; and by Law *Now*, as well as *Then*; and I shall pay the Clerk for the Extract, and 40 *lib.* besides. And yet, notwithstanding of these frequent, open and proclaim'd *Rebellions*, an *Indulgence* was granted to *Dissenters* from the then established Church; and to Dissenters, on such points, or on the very same wherein they *now* differ from you: as this Writer asserts, and uses it to prove the

[5]
the unlawfulness of a Toleration *now*, though it was Duty *then*,

And on the other hand, tell me one Man of the present *Dissenters*, now craving Toleration, who own'd *K. William* and *Q. Mary*, as Sovereigns, and after so doing, did preach, write, pray against, excommunicate the King; incited others to rise in Arms against their Majesties, or rose actually in Arms against them; and the now Craver of *Toleration*, will fervidly cast them out of their Congregations.

I presume these Considerations in point of Fact will be over look'd.

But leaving that Motive of Severities, which then occur'd, and falls not now in our Case, I recurr again to the point of Identity of Case, *then* and *now*, as to the matter of Indulgence, that thence for Honesty, you may please to turn pleaders for it. And to prevail with the Ingenuous amongst you, let me very Transiently expose your Arguments against Toleration.

I shall leave that method used by many of you, to stir up the *Mobb* against this gentle Balme of Toleration, *viz.* your Reading Scriptures which express infallible Truths, Preaching orthodoxly in the generality, but unhappily in your Applications, drawing all, to point at *Scottish* (& only *Scottish*) Presbytery, to be only the spouse of Christ, Christ's Church, and to misapply what's said, to raise Zeal for the Eternal Truths, the Gospel Verities, The Fundamentals of Holy Religion; to raise the Acts of the Assembly of *Glasgow* and it's Progenie: *Mr. And. Melvils* anarchical Notions; and the latter, and yet more novel *Hierarchy*, and to entail Damnation on all, who run not into these Novations and Excesses; & especially on those who own a Toleration; which was *jure Divino*, *Anno 1688.* and now advis'd to be a prudent *Medium* for Peace to the Nation, and an *Anodine* to allay hurtful Heats.

I say, to leave that ill use of Scripture, let us consider your writings, at least some of them. In one of them

1. It is said, the *Toleration is not now necessary*; and is only to be granted when necessary, you say not necessary, because there is no sinful terms of *Communion*, Now imposed on *Dissenters*. For you, Page 3. in the *Gentlemans Letter*; Say, That our *Doctrine, Worship, Sacraments and Church Censures are the same that were professed under the late Prelacy*. If so, Why did you then desire a Toleration under the late *Prelacy*, when you agreed with them in all those things? For as to other things you might differ from *Bishops*; but not as to the worship &c. wherein, you say, you agreed. But under favour, did they by Direction or Authorized universal practice, and as a condition of Uniformity, & as a Distinguishing badge & Character, as it is in your Church, exclude the *Lords Prayer* in Publick Worship? did they cast off the *Symbol of the Apostles Faith* in the Covenant of *Baptism*? did they Spurn, and shut their Ears at, and refuse Conjunction in Singing *Praise and Glory* to the *B. Trinity*? Especially when *Arianism* and *Deism* hath again lifted the head so high? Tell now an equivalent *Parallel* used then in publick worship, which could afford so good a Reason, for no concurrence in Holy Worship.

The 2d. there; Is answered, by No.

The 3d. there, is; There are no Penal Statutes now against *Dissenters*; First *Quer.* Is not to be cast out from exercising the office of a Minister of Christ to which one is called, a Penalty? Is not hinderance to exerce it a Penalty? But however false the Position be, or True, Let the Argument be Stated, You should not desire to worship God in the way that you desire to do it, And with the Society that you love best: Why? Because there is no penalty imposed on you so doing; *ergo*: &c.

The 4th runs thus: You should let Presbyterian preachers have the Stipends ev'n when the people do not hear them, Why? Because the Government may give them Stipends who doe preach. Ergo the Presbyterian Ministers who do not preach should have the Stipends: And indeed if the Presbyterians will prevail with any to pay the other dissenting Preachers at half of 20. Mks. per. Sermon; they make no bad exchange for some Stipends.

The 5. is, That there are above 100 Episcopal Ministers now by Law Indulged to Preach; ergo, I know not what. But I argue thus, 100. Ministers are Indulged and enjoy Churches, ergo it is not unlawful to grant it, on the same or like reasons, to more. Why then all this Preaching and Bustle about its absolute Impiety? but allow me to draw another little Inference from the Position: And by way of Quære: is there any Sedition or Mobbing in these Parishes? does it stir up these People against the Government? Does it make People there, disaffected to the Government? Are there Addresses from these Parishes for Meeting Houses?

In this Paragraph you Insinuat a meekness in Assuming them in to you; i. e. to be Judged by you; and to be Judged as Mr. Grame in Dumfermlin was, whose Innocence made the truly moderat men to blush: or as you treated Mr. Robert Ross and Mr. Forbes, whose Processes Tabled before the Privy Council, for Redress, *tanquam de abusu*; and as in opposition to the little Indulgence granted Anno 1695 The Qs. Advocat and yours too, did avert Cunningly from being considered, to hide the Cruelty of these proceedings: and indeed an assumption on the terms of Uniformity, viz. to renew that League and Covenant expressly or Virtualy, witness the obligation in the several Synodical Registers: to quit the *Lords Prayer* in Publick Worship; to Baptize Infants on obligations to new Confessions of Faith, and not to the *Christian Creed* formerly used; to exclude all Liturgy; forbear publick Reading of
Scriptures

Scriptures; to assert Presbytery, in your Form, to be *jure Divino*; or if they come in, and then do not conform; to depose them as impious, unsound &c. What can all this mean or Import?

Now as to the Class of Inconveniences Summ'd up in that Paper?

The first is; They in deep wisdom conjecture that a Toleration will be so far from healing, and composing breaches that it would increase them. Pray, some shadow of reason for this conjecture? for men of as great experience and knowledge of the Nation think otherwise; and I give this amongst other Reasons, that Dissenters will be more quiet and less Troublesome when they have Liberty, & are free from persecution, than when they are restrained or Imprisoned for Preaching. For, *Nata*, their Arguments strike against all Liberty to Dissenters, for publick Worship; now believe this who list; *Confirmatur* from experience; what Trouble or Discord is there now in Indulged Parishes: It's true, the Presbyterians, or the Queens Advocat in their Name, may vex them for exercising their Worship. But when did they vex-prosecute or molest Presbyterians, for Preaching in, or to their Congregations? If it be intended that Dissenters shall be molested & persecuted for serving God in methods used by well Reformed Churches: if it be resolved that Mobs shall be stir'd up, *a la mod du Glasgow*, it is easy for the Designers to Prophesy such events. But did the Indulgences granted in the Violent times, to Presbyterians, in *Kilwinning* and other western Parishes, occasion stirrs in the West, in the late King James's Reign? no, on the Contrary was that not so easy to them that they concurr'd with others of that perswasion to address him for the continuance of it: albeit they did well know that it was calculated to Introduce Popery; and that several Laicks did quite Honourable Posts, rather than to Comply with it.

The

The Authors 3^d Objection, is as little, so as it is a wonder: For why is it more wonderful, that the *Episcopal* Doctrine was against Toleration to Dissenters, upon the account of Modes and Forms of Government, Than that the Presbyterian should preach the same now; The Difference of Modes and Forms being still the very same: For the great *Rabbies* of both Parties contend for a *jus Divinum*, or something like it; This is *ad hominem*; But the Wonder is, if there be any of the Presbyterians, who taught *then*, That it was impiety to refuse Toleration, who do now with heat assert it a Duty. The standing Law was *then* as strong against Presbytery, as *now* it is against Episcopacy. People may lawfully address and supplicate for Amendments in Laws, and Toleration from Rigours, without being *Rebels*: But no doubt they would be so, if they did rise in *Mobbs*, and assumed the Faculties of Jurisdiction, and Execution in the hands of a *Sovereign Mob*.

It is not fair to upbraid the Episcopal Party, Because some such are *Jacobites*: more than it were to upbraid Presbyterians with being Enemies to *Monarchy*, because some of them are such. The *Queen's* Title in the Claim of Right, is nothing the same with what is said in it for Presbytery. And being two different Articles, The first is untouched, altho' the second be rectified.

The Authors last Reach in relation to the *Queen*, is a little homely: After Her Assurances to maintain and protect the Church Government, Shall it be insinuated as a Breach, if She maintain others also in what they enjoy according to Law. I wish the Author had read twice, before he confidently asserted, That *no Toleration can be allowed, seing that Presbyterie is established by Law, without any such thing*. Seing the very Act of Parliament, concerning the Church, *Anno 1695*. Declares, That *such of the Episcopal Clergy as should take the Oath of Allegiance and*

and sign the Assurance, shall have His Majesties Protection
as to their Kirks and Benefices, And that Favour was so
oft recommended by His then Majesty K. William, to be
made good to them, that it is a wonder why his Desires were
not fulfilled then, or forgot now: And yet much more
strange, That ye should desire or expect from Her present
Majesty, more Severity against those of the Episcopal Per-
suasion, than they felt under His late Majesty K. William,
I leave saying further till the next occasion.

Postscript,
*Vindicating the Episcopal Doctrine of
Passive Obedience, and the Arch-
Bishop of Glasgows Sermon concern-
ing it.*

THE Author of *An Essay upon Toleration*, most
falsly asserts, pag. 19. That the Episcopal Party
have always set up for the Arbitrary and De-
spotick Power of the Prince; for it is not our, that
they have alway own'd that our Monarchy is a legal one
regulated, and limited in the Administration thereof, by
Laws; though at the same time they hold, That the per-
son of the KING is Sacred, and that he is not subject,
or accountable to his Subjects; but that His Ministers, Of-
ficers, Advisers and Executors of His Orders, may be ar-
raign'd, and punish'd, if they do any thing contrary to
Law.

Indeed they are not asham'd to owne the Doctrine of
Non-resistance, and Passive Obedience, duly explain'd, and
rightly

rightly understood, to be consonant to the Holy Scriptures, and to the practice of the purest primitive Christians, as well as agreeable to right Reason and Policy.

He heard, (he says) A. B. P. preaching on Eccles. 8. 4. Screw up the Supreme paramount power to such a prodigious height, that he asserted, the civil power, in no cases whatsoever should be resisted; no not in the case of the **KINGS** Alienation of His Crown to a Forreigner; and to put the Cape-stone upon his Mahumetan Loyalty, concluded with threatening us with eternal Damnation, if we should in any case make resistance to the **KING**, though acting never so illegally

It seems, he means the present Archbishop of Glasgow; But his Head having been under a leaden Cap, to cool the Distemper of his Brain, it seems that Cap hath spoil'd his *Memorie*, & turn'd his Brain into the same metal with it self; So that now he makes the *Acts* of his *Memorie*, to be only *Acts* of his malicious *Will*, as by his odd Philosophie, he makes the *Acts* of his *Judgement*, to be *Acts* of his *Will*, and not of his *Understanding*; it being only passive, as he owns page 13th. For that Sermon is still extant; and one who took it in writing, the time it was preach'd, can shew it; and in it these very words. viz. some *Exceptions* are made, of some cases, in which Resistance may be Lawfull; I shall name only two. 1^o. In case the King Jetts himself in an Hostile manner, to destroy all his Subjects, as some say Nero and Caligula did. 2^{do}. If the King should alienat the Crown to a Forreigner. I say, the first Case is not supposable, unless the King is altogether madd; for so he must intend to be a King without Subjects; and then he is to be put under the care of Physicians, to cure his Distraction: and Curators or Regents, are to be appointed to administer the Government in his Name, during that Lunacie; as is usual in the case of the Minorennity of the King; or as perhaps, was actually done in the instance of

[12]
Nebuchadnezzar, during his madness. The second is scarce to be supposed to exist, without a deep Melancholie or Madness in the King; who must be first under an Alienation of Mind, before he can Alienat his Crown; and in that Case, the former Method, by Physicians and Regents is to be used; And if no real madness is found in the King, when so alienating his Crown; then it is plain that he voluntarily Abdicates himself, and cedes his Right to Govern, and reduces himself to the State of an ordinary Subject: and so the resisting of him, is not to resist the King; he being no more King after his alienation: As for the Forreigner, to whom he doth most invalidly, because illegally, alienat his Crown, it being done without the consent of his Heirs, and of the three Estates of the Kingdom; he is such a person as may Lawfully be Resisted, without counteracting to the Doctrine of Non-Resistance; he not being the Lawfull King, as having no just Title to the Crown, nor the least colour to it, either by Inheritance or Election.

As for the Archbishop's threatening Damnation in Case of Resistance; he breathed out no threatnings, only modestly made use of St. Pauls words Rom. 13. 1. 2. 3. which expressly say; They that resist shall receive to themselves Damnation: and so with no better Reason, can he call the Archbishops Loyalty, a Mahometan Loyaltie, than he may call that Blessed Apostle a Turk: But the spirit of Lying, Malice and Calumnie, which is as just, as it is an old Character of a certain Sect, and Sett of People amongst us, must needs possess this brain-sick Author, in his so Impiously and Maliciously belying and defaming that venerable and Learned Prelat.

F I N I S.

holie
Alie-
ad in
gents
King
e vo-
cern
bject
e be-
sign-
alie-
f his
such
ling
Law-
r ibe

Cafe
mo-
2. 3.
hem-
an he
than
spirit
it is
le a-
r, in
ming

DI
or
I
H